

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,893	CADIENTE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Harry A. Grosso	3727

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Harry A. Grosso.

(3) _____.

(2) Mr. Francis Kalinski.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 27 March 2006

Time: 1:00PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Obviousness-type double patenting.

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Kalinski was advised that this application is subject to an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,962,263. Although the claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims show all the structure of the device. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 was needed to overcome the double patenting rejection.